

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Mary Lee Rosenbaum at 7:02 p.m., **Wednesday, April 6, 2005**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
Rolland Crawford, Division Chief/Fire Marshall
H.P. Kang, Senior Planner
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Dept.
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Guest Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that the discussion items be taken out of order. She asked that Item E.2 be heard first, as the discussion should be shorter. Chair Rosenbaum consented to change the order of the items.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public participation.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-05-17 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 03-02; ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-02; TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 15738; PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-08; AND, DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Assistant Planner Colunga gave the staff report stating that the project was continued from the regular meeting of March 2, 2005. He added that the applicant, SGA Limited was requesting a

General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, a Tract Map, a Precise Plan of Design and a Development Agreement for the 16-unit subdivision.

He explained that at the last meeting, the residents of the existing neighborhood expressed opposition to the removal of the dead end at Lilac Street, and the opening of Lane and State Streets; the applicant was asked to come up with a design alternative. He continued to say that the applicant met with staff on March 7th to review the design and stated that Lane and State Streets were shown connecting as a "knuckle" with Lots 1-6 having access off of Lane Street with Lilac Street as a cul-de-sac; ten Lots would take access off of this street, and Lots 7, 8, and 16 would share a 20-foot wide private driveway, which would link up to a pedestrian easement across Lots 6 & 7. Staff has provided Conditions of Approval to address potential concerns of vehicular access between the private drive and the street frontage at Lot 6.

Mr. Colunga continued to report that the project density remained at 6.5 units per acre with 10 two-story homes and six single story homes. He added that making Lilac Street into a cul-de-sac reduced the size of Lots 14 and 15, which were originally plotted with single story models. He explained that the applicant was showing a two-story, Plan 4 model on these two lots with Lots 13 and 16 as single-story plans. He reminded the Commission that at the October 6th meeting, opposition was also expressed concerning two-story units next to the existing single-story homes. He added that the Planning Commission might consider requiring the applicant to provide landscaping in the rear of these two units to address potential concerns of privacy.

Mr. Colunga mentioned that a Homeowner's Association (HOA) would maintain the front yard landscaping of each home and that the applicant had provided a conceptual landscape design with the details of the proposed pilaster and fence combination.

Mr. Colunga commented that the proposed subdivision and Precise Plan of Design were consistent with the proposed zoning designations and met the City's goal and policy to provide residents with a variety of housing opportunities and that the approval of the Development Agreement would enable the project to comply with the City's affordable housing requirements.

Mr. Colunga reported that the City had received two letters of concern from adjacent residents, one in favor of the design alternative and the other in opposition to the design of the perimeter wall combination of pilasters and cedar fencing. He added that both the Public Works and Fire Departments had reviewed the design alternative and neither one expressed any additional concerns or comments. He continued to say that the findings to approve the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, the subdivision, and the PPD had been provided.

Mr. Colunga stated that connecting Lilac Avenue, State Street, and Lane Street would improve vehicular circulation in the North Central Neighborhood, eliminate three dead end streets, and provide better access for emergency and City services in the area.

Before beginning the discussion on this item, Chair Rosenbaum informed the members of the audience that Item #3, General Plan Amendment (GPA) NO. 04-05; Zone Change (ZC) NO. 04-05; and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) NO. 05-01 will not be discussed as previously advertised, at the request of the applicant but will be addressed at the May 4, 2005 Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Rosenbaum open the public comment period at 7:16 p.m.

Debbie Ingalls, 25448 Lane Street, Loma Linda commented that she was impressed with the new design of the project and was happy that the changes that were requested by the residents were taken into consideration. She added that she approved of the new plan for the project.

Cindy Chrisler, 25446 Lane Street, Loma Linda commented that the current plan was a better fit with the neighborhood and that she was happy with the way the Planning Commission and the developer included the current residents in the design of the project and listened to what they had to say.

Chris Sahlin, 25370 State Street, Loma Linda spoke to the fact that there were two-story homes planned for Lots 14 & 15 and that he would have preferred one-story houses because the new residents would be able to see into his house from the second floor. He added that the perimeter wall should be constructed of concrete blocks.

Barry Lee O'Conner, 10782 Jasmine, Loma Linda stated that he had the same concerns as Mr. Sahlin about the six foot wall because it would obstruct the view shed, natural light and would hinder air circulation. He also commented on the two-story houses being too close to his home.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 7:22 p.m.

Assistant Planner Colunga suggested that the applicant could address the concerns provided during the comment period. Chair Rosenbaum consented.

Mohammed Younes, PBSJ, 10370 Hemet Street, Riverside CA, engineer for the project explained that the two-story homes were planned for those lots because of the changes requested for the knuckle that would allow emergency vehicles to turn around.

A discussion followed regarding the placement of block walls and what materials could be used to make the walls less unsightly. Chair Rosenbaum commented that she would prefer not to have any more if they were not absolutely necessary. Commissioner Neff suggested that using split-face blocks might help to enhance the wall. Commissioner Sakala commented that the applicant had responded so well to the residents' comments that the wall was acceptable to her. There was a brief discussion regarding 1.5-story homes planned for the project. Mr. Art Martinez, architect for the project explained that the windows of the two-story and 1.5-story houses would be placed on the side of the houses so that they would not overlook anyone's back yard.

Chair Rosenbaum re-opened the public comment period at 7:34 p.m.

Chris Sahlin, 25370 State Street, Loma Linda commented that the lots were large enough and had a shape that would allow the architect to redesign the houses and place three single-story homes on those lots.

Barry Lee O'Conner, 10782 Jasmine, Loma Linda pointed out that when the project was initially presented, the residents had requested that the two-story houses be placed on the creek side of the piece of property.

Chair Rosenbaum pointed out for the record that the applicant had completely redesigned his project and decreased the number of homes in his project by close to 50% in consideration of the current residents in the neighborhood.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 7:41 p.m.

Chair Rosenbaum pointed out that she would like the last sentence on page 3, Item H – Usable Open Space in the Planned Community document, which stated, “ Therefore, the objective is to minimize the ongoing maintenance cost” because maintenance costs would be part of the HOA fees. She also pointed out that Item I should be revised so that it ties in with Item H regarding HOA fees.

Mr. Colunga stated that the applicant was looking to the Commission for guidance regarding the block pilasters and cedar fencing being proposed for installation between the houses. He added that the Commission had shown interest in the past for vinyl fencing if the Commission was interested in requiring this type of material.

The Planning Commission discussed wood fences, the private drive for lots 5, 6 and 16 and the following Conditions of Approval:

Condition 1.14

Mr. Colunga clarified that the chain link fence would be used during construction only.

Condition 1.18

Regarding carriage door style garage doors, add “if appropriate” at the end of the first sentence.

Condition 1.29

Mr. Colunga explained that the applicant had requested that the requirement for fences between the houses be waived. Mr. Cliff Hoskins, Landscape Architect, 1690 Minorca Place, Costa Mesa, CA, stated that the intent had never been to get out of installing an interior fence but he did want to get direction from the Commission on the type of fencing they would require. He did confirm that there would be fencing in the rear yards and that the Homeowners’ Association would ensure that the proper materials would be used for the side yards.

Mr. Colunga stated that he would add a condition between Conditions 1.29 and 1.30 addressing the block wall along the perimeter of lots 13 to 16.

Commissioner Neff stated that he still wasn’t sure how to resolve the issue of the two-story building if that was the intent of the Planning Commission. Staff explained that there had been considerable review with the applicant and the current plan was the best outcome. Chair Rosenbaum encouraged the Commission to reflect on the substantial transformation from the initial project submitted in October 2004 and the revised plan as reviewed by the Planning Commission this evening.

Director Woldruff explained that staff’s recommendation had not changed from the original 16-unit plan with the roadway going through because staff thought that it was the best design. However, staff has worked with the applicant to provide an alternative as discussed at the previous Planning Commission meeting. She added that the Commission’s motion would have to include the language to approve the alternative plan.

Motion by Neff, seconded by Sakala, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Christianson recused, to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration; Approve

and adopt General Plan Amendment No. 03-02 and Zone Change No. 03-02 based on the Findings; Approve Tentative Tract Map No. 15738 and Precise Plan of Design No. 04-08 as shown on the Alternative Site Plan based on the Findings and subject to the amended Conditions of Approval; Approve the Development Agreement; and forward to City Council for a meeting in May 2005.

PC-05-18 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 04-05; ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 04-05; AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) NO. 05-01

Commissioner Christianson returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Umeda recused himself from the discussion to avoid a conflict of interest, as his residence was located within the 500-foot radius of the project site.

Assistant Planner Colunga explained that staff and the applicant had agreed to request a continuance to the regular meeting of May 4, 2005 to allow time for staff and the applicant to resolve some issues and revise the project further. He added that the City had received an additional 11 letters of opposition to the project.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 8:10 p.m. As there was no public comment received, Chair Rosenbaum closed the comment period at 8:11 p.m.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Umeda recused to continue the item to the next regular meeting of May 4, 2005.

Director Woldruff commented that the representative for the applicant for Item 4, Mr. Miguel Rojas was in audience and suggested that because of the nature of the next item that the Commission might want to continue this item. Chair Rosenbaum commented that she hoped to address the project during this meeting, but she realized that she might not because of the time and the nature of the next item. She encouraged Mr. Rojas to stay but if he lost hope of being able to make his presentation to the Commission, he could leave and the item would be continued to the May 4, 2005 meeting.

PC-05-19 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT, DRAFT HILLSIDE DESIGNATION

Director Woldruff presented the staff report. She reported that the Commission had two public workshops, one in January and one in February, and based on the input received the consultant Mr. Lloyd Zola prepared a new draft. She continued to say that the Draft General Plan Hillside Designation had changed in an effort to find a middle ground between the development community and the conservation groups for the south hills.

Director Woldruff stated that the City Council had requested that staff prepare a comparison table of what some of the different designations that have been in place for the last 10 or 15 years would yield and to look at the history of designations in the south hills.

Staff discovered that Resolution #1744, adopted in 1993 in an effort to forestall the first initiative, anticipated a maximum of 1,780 units without putting a cap on it, and if that number was multiplied by a straight density without consideration of a slope density, the yield would be really high.

Ordinance 495, which was the first initiative, was approved by the voters and became the general plan and effectively integrated policies into the existing hillside designation and rendered Resolution #1744 unusable. The initiative amendment, Ordinance 541 further affected Resolution #1744. She added that there was no explanation about how the existing general plan, as it shows the south hills, came into effect.

Mr. Lloyd Zola of LSA Associates explained that the purpose of the meeting was to talk about various proposals for development and conservation in the southern hillsides and get to a point where staff could have clear policy direction for the general plan. He continued to say that there several things that needed to be accomplished as follows: 1) define permitted uses; 2) set the maximum development intensities; and, 3) establish general rules for development and conservation while retaining reasonable economic use of all properties.

Mr. Zola added that the process he and staff had used to arrive at the new language for the Hillside Designation, as follows:

- Review proposals for development and conservation within Loma Linda's southerly hillside areas;
- Provide clear General Plan policy direction.

The following considerations were taken into account in developing the new Hillside designation:

- Existing Hillside Initiative and General Plan - The southern hillside area comprised of 3,151 acres with flat benches in the northeast north of the toe of slope, broad flat valley in the southeast; rural in character generally to the east, and scattered, small flat to rolling valley areas to steep hillsides, and canyons and steep hillside areas;
- Slope steepness and differences in landforms within the hillside area;
- Access – Limited roadways – Oakwood Drive intersection with Barton Road and the potential connection through Reche Canyon Road;
- Viewsheds – Large lots and low density to reduce landform modification, but increase length of roadways; placement and design of individual structures; clustering to preserve large unbroken blocks of open space and reduce roadways, but increased landform modification within developed areas; ridgeline policies to distinguish primary and secondary ridgelines.
- Habitats – A large, unbroken block of open space habitat and habitat quality is moderate overall.
- Recreation – Trails plan being prepared to incorporate into the General Plan.
- Environmental hazards – Earthquake fault, slope steepness and stability, and erosion.

Mr. Zola continued to say that public testimony so far has been in agreement on the following points:

- Retire development rights of City parcel;
- Maximize public open space;
- Cluster future development;
- Limit number of access points.

He added that public testimony has been in disagreement with the following items:

- The extent to which public open space can be maximized by clustering and restricting the location of development;
- The maximum allowable number of dwelling units (500 vs. 1800); and

- The specific location of access points.

Mr. Zola presented the following recommendations:

- 1) Land Use
 - Restrict land uses to residential.
- 2) Development Density
 - Permit densities on the flat bench areas at the toe of slopes similar to existing development immediately to the north;
 - Retire development density on the City's parcel;
 - Allow a maximum density of one unit per 2.5 acres over the balance of the area;
 - Provide development guidelines to be met by new development;
 - Maximum density is not guaranteed.
- 3) Provide for acquisition of additional public open space, while recognizing individual property rights;
- 4) Encourage clustering of future development.
- 5) Require vertical and horizontal setbacks from major ridgelines.
- 6) Area north of toe of slope: two dwelling units per acre.
 - Low density suburban enclave;
- 7) Hillside areas not within Initiative: one dwelling unit per two acres.
 - Protect existing development along Pilgrim Road.
- 8) Incentives for transfer of density out of the Initiative area.
- 9) Cluster development to avoid north-facing slopes

Mr. Zola stated that staff met with hillside landowners and members of the Conservation Society early on April 6, 2005, which resulted in modifications to staff's recommendations to the Planning Commission, as follows:

- 1) Establish the density north of the toe of slope at two units per acre in front of the ridgelines and one unit per two acres behind it to be designated as low-density suburban enclave to preclude high-density development such as small lot subdivisions.
- 2) Add provisions to establish densities consistent and compatible with the existing rural development on Pilgrim Road and allow commercial animal keeping because those types of operations exist today; provide a buffer adjacent to the development and encourage clustering as far away as would be feasible.
- 3) Establish potential incentives for transferring density of what would otherwise be allowed in a cluster development out of the Initiative area and dedicating half of the land for public open space. The incentive would be to be able to add to development density outside of the Initiative area; also establish policies to encourage transferring densities off the north facing slopes to the area behind the ridge so that clustering of development would exclude development along the north facing slopes.
- 4) Eliminate all references to "anticipated" maximum density that may still exist in the General Plan and simply establish a maximum density.

The Planning Commissioners provided comments on the following topics:

- Advantage of City owning and maintaining dedicated land for public open space – Mr. Zola explained that the objective would be to create large blocks of open space for easy access by everyone and not have inaccessible piece-meal parcels – Director Woldruff added that there could be the possibility of creating a conservancy to manage the open spaces.
- Access road along the railroad tracks and issues of evacuation in the event of a disaster – Director Woldruff stated that she had seen development plans in the past that suggested the possibility of extending the road off Beaumont Avenue. Fire Marshall Crawford stated that he anticipated that the Fire Department would require at least two points of access, something from the north or the south and/or southeast. He added that the Fire Code did provide the Fire Department with the option of requiring two or more points of access.

Commissioner Umeda stated that he agreed with the concept of very low density in the bench area and with the concept of density transfer out of the Hillside Initiative and commented that staff had come up with a balanced plan.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 8:55 p.m.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda stated that he saw two main issues that needed to be addressed: 1) starting density zones for the south hills; and, 2) the lack of clustering rules and transfers for acquisition of open space. He suggested using the Trails Development Committee's recommendations.

He further commented on the following topics:

- Allowance for mass grading should be limited to clustering areas;
- The limitations imposed because road access;
- The west end of the Hillside removed from the conservation area – it is a larger ridge than the one on Lawton and he recommended that it be considered part of the Hillside;
- Ridgeline setbacks within 50.0 feet of the ridgeline – roofline would be visible – recommended that the setbacks be doubled to 100.0 feet;
- Riparian setbacks – recommended 200.0 feet in case density transfers do not occur – set policy should be instituted from the beginning; suggested how development could occur to retain the largest blocks of open space possible;
- Agreed with retirement of city owned property but can negotiate with developer if project is good.

He summarized his comments as follows:

- Starting density lower;
- Include west end corner in Initiative;
- Establish an incentive structure and programs for developers.

Commissioner Umeda asked Mr. Zirkle what he considered to be a large incentive.

Mr. Zirkle suggested:

- 1) No mass grading and no flat pad development be allowed; and,
- 2) Reasonable lot sizes, i.e. one-half acre, with transfer of densities anywhere and bonuses to use in clustering areas.

Kathy Glendrange, Beaumont Avenue, Loma Linda stated that she appreciated the improvements and the reduced density. She advocated no commercial use, and approved of the City land remains as public open space. She added that in her opinion developers only wanted to make money with their property and the Land Use plan favored them. She advocated minimum lot size in the hills and no changes to the current density. Ms. Glendrange stated that she supported clustering with one-acre lots, with 5.0-10.0 acre lots on the north-facing slope and one half-acre lots on the south-facing slope. When asked what she considered a rural density, Ms. Glendrange replied that she considered 2.5-acre lots as rural with 5.0-acre lots on the slopes.

Commissioner Sakala asked about the area in the southeast towards San Timoteo Canyon Road being described as rural. Mr. Zola explained the reason behind the modification for the area was to move the density from the north face of the slope to behind the ridge.

David Werner, 11469 Campus Street, Loma Linda stated that he was there to represent himself and had not asked, nor given anyone the authority to represent him or his interests. The process was to create a vision for the City, a vision that can be made real. He added that his vision for the City of Loma Linda was one of a series of vibrant communities, which offered something unique and valuable to the entire City. He commented that the principles that guided the vision were provided by the Constitution, which established the right of private ownership of land and self-determination. He commented on the possible roadblocks to the development of the south hills such as the overload of infrastructure, transportation and safety issues. Mr. Werner continued to say that he found it difficult to understand that some individuals who considered themselves the elite were expecting to be entitled to use the undeveloped properties, which they do not own, for their own personal use and who would embrace the idea of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, but forget and somehow reject the right of private ownership of property.

Mr. Werner stated that his personal vision for the South Hills would be a development where everyone would benefit. He agreed with the precept that this process was not to critique a specific development proposal. He concluded stating that it was important for the Planning Commission to have a vision, which cared about the future of the City of Loma Linda.

Leroy Hansberger, 555 Cajon Street, Redlands commented on the general perception that all developers were unnecessarily greedy, that they had no vision and refused to work with the community. He gave a brief history of their ownership of the property relative to the Hillside Initiative. He pointed out that they were not short-term landowners and added that he had been working and cooperating with the City for 30 years and that if the plan was adopted as it was written, their investment was not worth very much.

Glenn Elssmann, Mission Development, 25814 Business Center Drive, Suite C, Redlands thanked staff and Mr. Zola for their time and work with the Loma Linda Conservation Society to try to find common agreement for the development of the South Hills. He added that he agreed on the following issues:

- Designation of City land as permanent open space;
- Protection of the north facing slope;
- Principles of vertical and horizontal setbacks to eliminate the rooflines from view from the north side;
- Reduction in density from 4-5 dwelling units per acre from Beaumont Avenue;
- Emergency access can be provided on the east end for emergency vehicles only;

- Transfer as much development out of Scott Canyon to the east as possible with incentives to achieve the goal;
- Elimination of any ambiguity for the maximum allowable densities;
- Establishment of policies and guidelines as mechanisms to lock in the properties as open space in perpetuity.

Mr. Elssmann summarized stating that policies and guidelines that staff was recommending would be a fair and balanced way to address the needs and vision of the community.

Joe Bonadiman, 234 N. Arrowhead Avenue, San Bernardino, CA stated that he was a civil engineer representing the Ramirez Family and the property they own in the area. He commented that his clients appreciated that a plan was completed that will last through the years. He added that the City had hired competent staff that made informed recommendations with the best interests of the City in mind and that he respected the work they did. He advised the Planning Commission to listen and to trust the experienced professional staff and the qualified consulting firm because both knew what they were doing.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda stated it was important that the Planning Commission take into consideration comments provided by the residents of Loma Linda. He added that many of the changes in the revised document resulted from public input. He remarked that the Planning Commission needed to establish policy to determine the real vision for the City of Loma Linda and commented that the development credits concept included in this plan, should be started at the lower end of the density range.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 10:05 p.m.

Director Woldruff explained to the Planning Commission that the City Council had agreed to meet to review the Land Use Element, which included the Hillside Designation, on April 26, 2005 and therefore, the Commission must address the Hillside Designation, formulate and forward their recommendations to the Council this evening.

Commissioner Neff had questions regarding transfer credits and Mr. Zola replied that they would be based on the following characteristics:

- Use of the Trails Development Committee's trails map, as approved by City Council to determine the best location for public open space;
- Lower the basic density and provide greater bonuses for lowering the density;
- No one wanted to see 100 acres subdivided into 2.5 acre lots;
- Mass grading allowed only in the clustered areas;
- Development incentives for retiring development rights within the Trails Development Committee's recommended area, as approved by the City Council;
- Two-acre lots north of the toe of the slope.

The Planning Commission instructed Mr. Zola to make the following recommendations to City Council:

- 1) Identify open space for City-owned land – 767 acres plus any additional land;
- 2) Designate land subject to the Initiative with provisions of Hillside Initiative;
- 3) Set the density at two dwelling units per acre north of the toe of slope, low density inclusive;
- 4) Show base density within the balance area of the Hillside Conservation at one dwelling unit per five acres or one dwelling unit per 10.0 acres;

- 5) Allow for clustering – Provide density between the low density requested by the Loma Linda Conservation Society and the current approved General Plan;
- 6) Require recommendation to avoid development north of face of slope per the policies of the Fire Department;
- 7) Base open space on the Trails Development Committee's recommended area, as approved by the City Council;
- 8) Set ridgeline setbacks from the roofline – specify setback in Zoning Code.

Attorney Holdaway commented that the Planning Commission's recommendations address policy issues that are the purview of the City Council. He offered that Mr. Zola provide suggestions and make changes to the text that he would present to City Council on behalf of the Commission.

Chair Rosenbaum asked if a map of the ridgelines would be added to the document. Mr. Zola replied that if the Commission wanted a map of primary ridgelines he could add a definition and a map for them if necessary. He added that he would also need a number or wording for the new section.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he wished to commend Councilman Robert Christman who was instrumental in achieving the designation of 767 acres of City-owned land as permanent open space.

Commissioner Umeda asked for and received confirmation from staff on his understanding that the Development Code was still to be prepared and would address the practical issues. He suggested that the Commission endorse Mr. Zola's recommendations and have them added to the draft document and presented to City Council.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 4-1, Sakala abstaining, to approve the Draft Hillside Designation text as amended for inclusion in the Land Use Element (2.0) and forward the document to the City Council for a meeting in April 2005.

PC-05-20 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 04-04, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 04-04, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 17209, PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-09 AND A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Director Woldruff suggested that due to the late hour the item be continued to the next regular meeting of May 4, 2005.

Motion by Neff, Seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried, to continue the item to the regular meeting of May 4, 2005.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Sakala stated that she was considering resigning from the Planning Commission and asked about the procedure. Director Woldruff replied that she would contact her during the following week to assist her.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff reported that the Public Safety Department was now known as the Fire Department. The change occurred in July 2004 when the Community Development Department acquired the Code Enforcement Division.

Director Woldruff added that preparation for the April 10, 2005 Planning Commission workshop were under way.

The Meeting was adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of August 3, 2005.

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2005\04-06-05M-app.doc